DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 824 RC 013 326

AUTHOR Conrad, Dan; Hedin, Diane
TITLE Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., St. Paul. Center for Youth Development and Research.
SPONS AGENCY General Mills Foundation, Wayzata, Minn.; Rockefeller Family Fund, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 66p.; For related document, see RC 013 325.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Youth Development and Research, Univ. of Minnesota, 386 McNeal Hall, St. Paul, MN 55108 ($5.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; *Experiential Learning; *Measurement Objectives; Measurement Techniques; *Questionnaires; *Semantic Differential; Student Development
IDENTIFIERS *Experiential Education Evaluation Project; *Experiential Education Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

As a result of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project the publication identifies instruments used to measure and assess experiential learning programs. The following information is given for each instrument: rationale for its inclusion in the study; precise issues or outcomes designed to measure, validity and reliability data; and directions on how to score. Descriptions of assessment tools are organized according to four categories: Instruments on Social Development (Social and Personal Responsibility Scale, Semantic Differential on Attitudes toward Others, Semantic Differential on Community Participation, and Career Exploration Scale); Instruments on Psychological Development (Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale); Instruments on Intellectual Development (Problem-Solving Inventory); and Instruments on Differential Program Impact (Characteristics of a Community Field Experience Checklist, Experiential Educational Questionnaire). The appendix contains the complete Experiential Education Questionnaire, pre-test and post-test. (ERB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215824

Instruments

and Scoring Guide

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diane Hedin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

EVALUATION PROJECT

Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project

by

Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin

Center for Youth Development and Research
University of Minnesota
1985 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108

The work upon which this publication is based was made possible by grants from the Rockefeller Family Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, and the General Mills Foundation. The Spring Hill Conference Center provided the Project with an environment conducive to thoughtful and productive working sessions. We also wish to acknowledge the contributions of Cathy Ingle Carlson and Howard Wolfe in the compilation and analysis of the data.

September 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Purpose of this Publication	3
1. Impact on Social Development of Students	4
2. Impact on Psychological Development of Students	4
3. Impact on Intellectual Development of Students	4
4. Differential Impact of Program Types and Formats	5
Instruments on Social Development	
Social and Personal Responsibility Scale	6
Semantic Differentials	16
Career Exploration Scale	22
Instruments on Psychological Development	
Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	25
Janis--Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale	27
Instruments on Intellectual Development	
Problem Solving Inventory	29
Instruments on Differential Program Impact	
Characteristics of a Community Experience Checklist	45
Appendix	48
Bibliography	61

Introduction

The Experiential Education Evaluation Project was undertaken to assess the impact of experience-based programs on student participants in secondary schools. For purposes of this research effort, experiential programs are defined as "educational programs offered as an integral part of the general school curriculum, but taking place outside of the conventional classroom, where students are in new roles featuring significant tasks with real consequences, and where the emphasis is on learning by doing with associated reflection."

The Project had four major purposes: 1) to define experiential education and develop a typology of programs; 2) to assess the impact of experiential education programs on the psychological, social and intellectual development of secondary school students; 3) to identify existing measures and instruments and to design new ones for assessing these outcomes; and 4) to use this data to identify the program variables and practices that are most effective in facilitating student development.

The Project was initiated by the Commission on Educational Issues and co-sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Independent Schools, and the National Catholic Education Association. It evaluated 27 experiential programs in independent, public, and parochial schools around the country. Over 1,000 students participated in these programs. A preliminary study was also conducted involving nearly 4,000 students in 33 programs. An Executive Summary, containing a brief review of the work of the Project, a summary of findings, implications for

practice, and suggestions for future research is available from the Center for Youth Development and Research, 48 McNeal Hall, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108 at the cost of $2.00 per copy.

Primary funding for the Project was provided by the Spencer and Rockefeller Family Foundations with additional support from the General Mills Foundation. The Project was conducted by the Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, under the direction of Diane Hedin and Dan Conrad.

Purpose of this Publication

One key task of this Project was to identify appropriate methods and instruments for assessing experiential education programs for adolescents. The task was challenging in that the objectives of experiential programs are varied, difficult to measure and often idiosyncratic to each specific program -- and even to individuals within a program. This, plus the fact that the programs are so action-oriented and are located in such divergent settings means that the traditional techniques of educational evaluation are not totally adequate for appraising their achievements.

A thorough review of available assessment tools which could measure the key program outcomes was undertaken. In rare cases, standardized instruments could be used without modification. In other cases, existing instruments needed to be adapted to more accurately capture the spirit and purpose of the programs being evaluated. In other cases, completely new instruments had to be designed. This publication contains the results of our efforts to identify existing measures and to design new ones for assessing experiential learning programs.

The following information is given for each instrument: a rationale for its inclusion in this study, the precise issues or outcomes it was designed to measure, validity and reliability data, and directions on how to score it.

The descriptions of these assessment tools are organized according to the four major research questions in the study. The categories and research questions are as follows:

1. Impact on Social Development of Students

To what extent do experiential programs have a positive impact on students' a) level of personal and social responsibility as measured by the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale; b) attitudes toward others as measured by a Semantic Differential on Adults and another Semantic Differential on Attitudes toward Others; c) attitudes toward active participation in the community as measured by a Semantic Differential on Community Participation; and d) involvement in career planning and exploration as measured by the Career Exploration Scale?

2. Impact on Psychological Development of Students

To what extent do experiential programs have a positive impact on students' general self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and their self-esteem in social situations as measured by the Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale?

3. Impact on Intellectual Development of Students

To what extent do experiential programs have a positive impact on students' problem-solving capacity as measured by the Problem-Solving Inventory?

4. Differential Impact of Program Types and Formats

In what ways do different program forms (community service, internships, political action, community study, and adventure education) and formats such as the features of the individual field experience affect student learning? This question was assessed through a variety of demographic data about the type of program, length, intensity, etc. The more complex questionnaire, which is included here, is the Characteristics of a Community Field Experience Checklist.

The entire Experiential Educational Questionnaire, pre-test and post-test, appears as Appendix I. Only the instruments named above are described in detail. The remainder are such straightforward items as demographic data on students including age, sex, grade point average, etc., descriptive information about the program format such as whether a classroom and seminar existed, how often students went to their field placement, etc., and need no further explanation.

Instruments on Social Development

Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

Of all the reported outcomes of experiential education programs, the ones most commonly cited by program directors were several clustering around the concept of responsibility. They reported that students learned to be on time, to fulfill obligations, to accept the consequences of actions, to take on demanding tasks, and the like. Some students may have learned through success and others by painful failure, but in either case, it was seen to be a useful lesson learned. This strong emphasis on responsibility paralleled the theoretical case for experiential learning and, as importantly, was strongly reaffirmed by the students themselves. The teaching and learning of responsibility has long been a prominent theme in American education, but seemed to hold a special significance to the proponents of experiential education.

Despite the prominence which the concept of responsibility has had in the rhetoric of American schooling and adolescent socialization, relatively little is known empirically about how responsibility develops -- or even what the concept exactly means. Moreover, there are few tools for measuring growth in these areas. The most commonly used instrument is the Social Responsibility Scale (SRS) by Berkowitz and Daniels (1964), which was based on work by Dale Harris (1957). The SRS has been widely used in research, but was considered inappropriate for the present study on these counts: 1) its tendency, even intent, to elicit what the subjects consider to be socially desirable responses (Stone, 1965; Berkowitz, 1965); 2) its focus on attitudes only; and 3) its heavy emphasis on general social referrents of responsibility.

A new responsibility scale was created for this study, the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS) and is reproduced below.

INSTRUCTIONS

A. Look at the sample question below, but don't answer it until you have very carefully read the instructions below.

Almost Always True For Me	Some-times True For Me			Some-times True For Me	Almost Always True For Me
☐	☐	Some teenagers worry about school grades	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't seem to worry about school grades.	☐ ☐

B. To answer these questions, there are two steps.

1) First, decide whether YOU are more like the teenagers on the left side who worry about school grades OR the teenagers on the right side who don't seem to worry about school grades. Don't mark anything down yet, but first decide which type of teenager is most like you and go to that side.

2) Second, now that you have decided which side is most like you, decide whether that is almost always true for you or sometimes true for you. If it's only sometimes true, then put an X in the box under sometimes true, if it's almost always true for you, then put an X in the box under almost always true.

C. Now continue to do the numbers below. For each number, you only check one box.

	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel bad when they let people down who depend on them	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't let it bother them that much.	☐ ☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think it's the responsibility of the community to take care of people who can't take care of themselves	-BUT-	Other teenagers think that everyone should just take care of themselves.	☐ ☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in doing something about school problems	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't really care to get involved in school problems.	☐ ☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers let others do most of the work in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers help in a group all they can.	☐ ☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers seem to find time to work on other people's problems	-BUT-	Other teenagers find taking care of their own problems more than enough to do.	☐ ☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in what other students in class have to say	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't care that much about what other students say.	☐ ☐
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in doing something about problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers are not that interested in working on problems in the community.	☐ ☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers carefully prepare for community and school assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers usually don't prepare that much.	☐ ☐

SPRS Cont'd.

	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers would rather not present ideas in a group discussion	-BUT-	Other teenagers feel comfortable in presenting ideas in a group discussion.	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers let others know when they can't keep an appointment	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't call ahead when they can't make it.	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think people should only help people they know--like close friends and relatives	-BUT-	Other teenagers think people should help people in general--whether they know them personally or not.	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	For some teenagers, it seems too difficut to keep commitments	-BUT-	Other teenagers somehow manage to keep commitments.	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers' ideas are almost always listened to in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers have a hard time getting the group to pay attention to their suggestions.	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think they have much say about what happens to them	-BUT-	Other teenagers think they can pretty much control what will happen to their lives.	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think it makes much sense to help others unless you get paid for it	-BUT-	Other teenagers think you should help others even if you don't get paid for it.	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are good at helping people	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't see helping others as one of their strong points.	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel obligated to carry out tasks assigned to them by the group	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't feel that bound by group decisions.	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think when good things happen it's because of something they did	-BUT-	For others, there seems to be no reasons--it's just luck when things go well.	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some teenagers prefer to have someone clearly lay out their assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers prefer to make up their own lists of things to do.	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Some teenagers aren't that worried about finishing jobs they promised they would do	-BUT-	Other teenagers would feel really bad about it.	☐	☐
21.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think they are able to help solve problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't think they can do anything about them because a few powerful people decide everything.	☐	☐

While a few items on general social responsibility could be adapted from the aforementioned scales, it was necessary to alter the format of the questionnaire and to develop completely new items for other critical dimensions of responsibility. The intent was to create a scale that would be more encompassing and, at the same time, be related more directly to the experiences of students in community-based educational programs. The rationale and format for this newly-designed instrument are described in detail below.

Responsibility is a multi-faceted concept, which includes three major dimensions -- attitudes, competence, and efficacy. The SPRS is built on the assumption that a person will act in a responsible manner when the following conditions are present. First, one must feel a sense of responsibility or have a responsible attitude toward others in the society. Second, one must have competence to act upon this feeling of concern for others. Finally, one must have a sense of efficacy, which allows one to believe that taking action and feeling concern can make a difference.

Subscales

The subscales of the SPRS assess the extent to which students 1) have responsible attitudes; 2) feel competent to act responsibly; 3) feel a sense of efficacy to take responsibility; and 4) perform responsible acts. The subscale key (pp. 13-15) gives the actual item and the way it is scored on a 4-point scale with 1 being the lowest score and 4 the highest.

1) Attitudes Toward Being Responsible

Attitudes about responsibility are further subdivided into social welfare and duty. The social welfare subscale focuses on the extent to which one feels concerned about problems and issues in the wider society. For example, the following is a social welfare attitude item: "Some teenagers are interested in doing something about problems in the community, but other teenagers are

not that interested in working on problems in the community." (Items 2, 7, 11, 15)

The duty subscale focuses on the extent to which one feels bound to personally meet social obligations, and includes items such as: "Some teenagers feel bad when they let people down who depend on them, but other teenagers don't let it bother them that much;" and "Some teenagers feel obligated to carry out tasks assigned to them by the group, but other teenagers don't feel that bound by group decisions." (Items 1, 10, 17, 20)

2) Competence to Take Responsibility

While a person may have a positive attitude toward others, s/he may still not be able to act in a responsible manner if s/he has not the competence or skill to do so. For example, if one sees a drowning person and feels a sense of responsibility toward helping him, he still may not be able to do anything about the problem (and thus not truly be "responsible") if he does not know how to swim. Thus, competence is also a determining factor in acting responsibly. Items illustrating this are: "Some teenagers would rather not present ideas in a group discussion, but other teenagers feel comfortable in presenting ideas in a group discussion;" or "Some teenagers are good at helping people, but other teenagers don't see helping people as one of their strong points." (Items 9, 13, 16)

3) Efficacy Regarding Responsibility

Third, a person must be willing or be able to believe that taking responsible action will have an impact on the social or physical environment. This sense of efficacy is tapped by several items in the SPRS including: "Some teenagers don't think they have much to say about what happens to them, but other teenagers think they can pretty much control what will happen to their lives." (Items 14, 18, 19, 21)

4) Performance of Responsible Acts

Finally, the SPRS assesses the extent to which students perceive that they do act in responsible ways. The performance subscale includes: "Some teenagers let others do most of the work in a group but other teenagers help in a group all they can." (Items 4, 5, 8, 12)

Two items, both related to school issues, were not included in any of the subscales. The two items were "Some teenagers are interested in doing something about school problems but other teenagers don't really care to get involved in school problems" and "Some teenagers are interested in what other students in class have to say but other teenagers don't care that much about what others have to say." (Items 3 and 6) It was assumed that a young person's interest and participation in school governance may be influenced by a different set of factors than does their involvement in the broader world outside the school.

Question Format

A major problem in measuring responsibility is the susceptibility to socially desirable response sets, i.e., a person tends to present himself in a positive light, giving his idealized sense of responsibility, rather than his actual level. Berkowitz (1965) acknowledged this tendency on his own scale and has accepted it: "I would have been surprised and disappointed if the Social Responsibility Scale (SRS) ... had not been related to the various social desirability measures ... The SRS assesses a readiness to do what is socially desirable, including the giving of socially desirable responses to opinion statements" (p. 757). This however, appears to be a problem that attenuates both the validity and the utility of such scales. One way of attacking the problem is through question format. Harter (1978) has devised

a "structured alternative format" in which the respondent is presented with the following type of question:

Really true	Sort of true				Really true	Sort of true
☐	☐	Some kids often forget what they learn	BUT	Other kids remember things easily	☐	☐

The student is first asked to decide which kid is most like him or her and then asked whether this is only sort of true or really true for him or her. As Harter states: "The effectiveness of this question format lies in the implication that half of the kids in the world (or in one's reference group) view themselves in one way, whereas the other half view themselves in the opposite manner. That is, this type of question legitimizes either choice." Confidence in this format is bolstered by the fact that "the children's verbal elaborations on the reasons for their choices indicate that they are giving accurate self-perceptions rather than socially desirable responses" (Harter, 1978). For all these reasons, this type of question format seemed ideally suited for the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale and was used with only slight alteration. Rather than use the terms "really true" or "sort of true" as Harter did, "almost always true for me" and "sometimes true for me" were used.

Validity and Reliability

Because the scale was created specifically for this study, it had not undergone thorough analysis regarding its validity and reliability. Some tests were done before it was used, however, and others were performed as part of the overall research effort. Its construct validity was strengthened by several factors: its objective scoring system; random reversal of items to eliminate

response bias; standardized administration procedures. The format is both clear and readable as established by extensive pretesting of the scale and empirical investigation of reading level (grades 7/8 on the Dale-Chall Reading Level Test and grade 7 on the Fry test). In addition, several items were adapted from the standardized Berkowitz SRS, and these and others were examined by other researchers including Harter and Connell of the University of Denver who have been working on ways to assess responsibility in elementary school children. Finally, five independent judges agreed (.92) on the category placement of the 21 items in the scale. Tests for concurrent validity were designed as part of the study itself including establishing correlations between SRS and teacher supervisor ratings on student responsibility. Reliability for the test as a whole was checked through the use of Cochran's Q and a reliability level of .83 was obtained.

SUBSCALE KEY - SOCIAL AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY SCALE

Master list of items grouped according to subscale:

A. Attitudes on Social Welfare

B. Attitudes on Duty

C. Competence

D. Efficacy

E. Performance

Scoring Key 4 = highest; 1 = lowest.

Scores (4, 3, 2, or 1) are in the box for each individual item.

ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
A. ATTITUDES ON SOCIAL WELFARE					
2. 4	3	Some teenagers think it's the responsibility of the community to take care of people who can't take care of themselves	-BUT-	Other teenagers think that everyone should just take care of themselves.	2	1
7. 4	3	Some teenagers are interested in doing something about problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers are not that interested in working on problems in the community.	2	1
11. 1	2	Some teenagers think people should only help people they know--like close friends and relatives	-BUT-	Other teenagers think people should help people in general--whether they know them personally or not.	3	4
15. 1	2	Some teenagers don't think it makes much sense to help others unless you get paid for it	-BUT-	Other teenagers think you should help others even if you don't get paid for it.	3	4
B. ATTITUDES ON DUTY						
1. 4	3	Some teenagers feel bad when they let people down who depend on them	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't let it bother them that much.	2	1
10. 4	3	Some teenagers let others know when they can't keep an appointment	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't call ahead when they can't make it.	2	1
17. 4	3	Some teenagers feel obligated to carry out tasks assigned to them by the group	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't feel that bound by group decisions.	2	1
20. 1	2	Some teenagers aren't that worried about finishing jobs they promised they would do	-BUT-	Other teenagers would feel really bad about it.	3	4
C. COMPETENCE						
9. 1	2	Some teenagers would rather not present ideas in a group discussion	-BUT-	Other teenagers feel comfortable in presenting ideas in a group discussion.	3	4
13. 4	3	Some teenagers' ideas are almost always listened to in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers have a hard time getting the group to pay attention to their suggestions.	2	1
16. 4	3	Some teenagers are good at helping people	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't see helping others as one of their strong points.	2	1

ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
D. EFFICACY					
14. 1	2	Some teenagers don't think they have much say about what happens to them	-BUT-	Other teenagers think they can pretty much control what will happen to their lives.	3 4
18. 4	3	Some teenagers think when good things happen it's because of something they did	-BUT-	For others, there seems to be no reasons--it's just luck when things go well.	2 1
19. 1	2	Some teenagers prefer to have someone clearly lay out their assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers prefer to make up their own lists of things to do.	3 4
21. 4	3	Some teenagers think they are able to help solve problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't think they can do anything about them because a few powerful people decide everything.	2 1
E. PERFORMANCE					
4. 1	2	Some teenagers let others do most of the work in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers help in a group all they can.	3 4
5. 4	3	Some teenagers seem to find time to work on other people's problems	-BUT-	Other teenagers find taking care of their own problems more than enough to do.	2 1
8. 4	3	Some teenagers carefully prepare for community and school assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers usually don't prepare that much.	2 1
12. 1	2	For some teenagers, it seems too difficut to keep commitments	-BUT-	Other teenagers somehow manage to keep commitments.	3 4

Semantic Differentials

To Gordon Allport (1935), that an attitude is learned or changed through experience was so fundamental a fact that it formed part of his definition of what an attitude is. Similarly, to the teachers and students surveyed on the outcomes of experiential programs, nothing was so clear as that participation in community experiences affected attitudes toward others. It was thus imperative that some measure of attitude change be included in the study.

The semantic differential is a method of observing and measuring the psychological meaning of concepts. It is highly regarded as a tool for measuring people's feelings toward an object or concept, and is particularly useful in situations where people are likely to have emotional reactions to a topic but not well thought out opinions (Henerson, et al., 1978). The scale consists of adjectives and their antonyms listed on opposite sides of the page with seven attitude positions in between. At the top of the page, the attitude object is named as the heading. The attitude object may be stated as a word, a phrase, or even a picture. For example:

Zucchini

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Bad	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Good
Beautiful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Ugly
Friendly	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Unfriendly

Charles Osgood (1957), the originator of the scale, found that the adjective pairs fall into clusters (or factors) of meaning. The most commonly used clusters are evaluative (e.g., good - bad), potency (e.g., strong - weak), and activity (e.g., fast - slow), though it is possible to use only one cluster or even more than these three. A person's or group's score is usually reported as an average or mean for each of the clusters employed.

In a review of the semantic differential technique, Kerlinger (1973) concluded that it "can be applied to a variety of research problems. It has been shown to be sufficiently reliable and valid for many research problems. It is also flexible and relatively easy to adapt to varying research demands..." (p. 579). He went on to describe it as a useful and sensitive tool for studies of attitude change. As Heise (1969) observed, "there is probably no social psychological principle that has received such resounding cross-group and cross-cultural verification as the EPA (Evaluative, Potency & Activity) structure of SD (Semantic Differential) ratings" (p. 421).

Three semantic differential scales were used:

In one the object word was "adult." A common charge by critics of current socialization practices is that adolescents are too separated from meaningful interaction with adults. The implicit assumption is that separation breeds suspicion if not hostility, and that close contact with adults would promote more positive attitudes. It thus seemed important to see what this term connoted to young people and what effect a collegial relationship with adults might have on students' attitudes toward them. The scoring system and the subscales on evaluation, potency, and activity are shown on page 19.

A second object term was the type of person with whom the students were in primary contact in their field experience. The terms included "little kids," "junior high kids," "police," "businesspersons," "government officials," and "old people." It was hypothesized that students would develop more positive feelings toward the people with whom they were regularly interacting, and the same assumptions suggested above in relation to adult/adolescent interaction were thought to apply here too. The scoring system and subscales are shown on page 20.

A third object term was the phrase "being active in the community." It was hypothesized that participation in the community would affect students' understanding of the idea and their propensity to act on it. The scoring system and four subscales on a) evaluation, b) novelty, c) difficulty, and d) whether or not they would be active in the future, are shown on page 21.

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ON ADULTS

SCORING AND SUBSCALE KEY

The scale is divided into three subscales: Evaluative (E); Potency (P) and Activity (A). Subscale designations are indicated next to each item number.

The scale is scored on a 7-point scale with 1 = lowest and 7 = highest. Items keyed positively (+) have the more positive adjective on the right side and items keyed negatively (-) have the more positive adjective on the left side.

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure the meaning which an idea or a kind of person has for you by having you rate it by a series of descriptive words. Please make your judgments on the basis of what the kind of person or idea means to you. Do not worry or puzzle over individual terms. It is your first impressions, your immediate responses, that are wanted. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we do want your true impressions.

Here is how you are to mark this questionnaire. There are seven positions between each pair of words. If you feel the kind of person or idea is very closely related to one end of the scale, place your check mark next to that word (e.g. Hot: : : : : : :Cold.) If you feel the idea or person is closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : :Cold. If the idea or person seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but not really neutral) place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : :Cold.

Subscale	Keyed			ADULTS (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	
E	-	1.	Friendly	: : : : : : :	:Unfriendly
P	+	2.	Powerless	: : : : : : :	:Powerful
E	+	3.	Boring	: : : : : : :	:Interesting
P	-	4.	Confident	: : : : : : :	:Insecure
E	-	5.	Honest	: : : : : : :	:Dishonest
A	-	6.	Changing	: : : : : : :	:Settled
E	+	7.	Selfish	: : : : : : :	:Unselfish
P	-	8.	Successful	: : : : : : :	:Unsuccessful
E	-	9.	Smart	: : : : : : :	:Dumb
E	+	10.	Unfair	: : : : : : :	:Fair
P	-	11.	Competent	: : : : : : :	:Incompetent
A	+	12.	Stubborn	: : : : : : :	:Flexible
E	-	13.	Kind	: : : : : : :	:Mean
A	+	14.	Serious	: : : : : : :	:Fun-loving

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

ON ATTITUDES TOWARD OTHERS

SCORING AND SUBSCALE KEY

The scale is divided into three subscales: Evaluative (E); Activity and Potency (P). Subscale designations are indicated next to each item number.

The scale is scored on a 7-point scale with 1 = lowest and 7 = highest. Items keyed positively (+) have the most positive adjective on the right side and items keyed negatively (-) have the most positive adjective on the left side.

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure the meaning which an idea or a kind of person has for you by having you rate it by a series of descriptive words. Please make your judgments on the basis of what the kind of person or idea means to you. Do not worry or puzzle over individual terms. It is your first impressions, your immediate responses, that are wanted. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we do want your true impressions.

Here is how you are to mark this questionnaire. There are seven positions between each pair of words. If you feel the kind of person or idea is very closely related to one end of the scale, place your check mark next to that word (e.g. Hot: X : : : : : :Cold. If you feel the idea or person is closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), place your check mark as follows: Hot: : X : : : : :Cold. If the idea or person seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but not really neutral) place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : X : : : :Cold.

Subscale	Keyed		TERM		# OF TERM
E	-	1.	Kind	: : : : : : :	:Mean
E	+	2.	Worthless	: : : : : : :	:Valuable
A	+	3.	Passive	: : : : : : :	:Active
E	-	4.	Important	: : : : : : :	:Unimportant
P	+	5.	Weak	: : : : : : :	:Strong
E	-	6.	Smart	: : : : : : :	:Dumb
E	-	7.	Interesting	: : : : : : :	:Boring
E	+	8.	Bad	: : : : : : :	:Good
E	+	9.	Useless	: : : : : : :	:Useful
E	-	10.	Beautiful	: : : : : : :	:Ugly
P	+	11.	Sick	: : : : : : :	:Healthy
A	+	12.	Slow	: : : : : : :	:Fast
P	-	13.	Competent	: : : : : : :	:Incompetent
A	-	14.	Complicated	: : : : : : :	:Simple
E	-	15.	Lovable	: : : : : : :	:Repulsive
				(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ON

BEING ACTIVE IN YOUR COMMUNITY

SCORING AND SUBSCALE KEY

The scale is divided into four subscales: Evaluative (E); Novelty (N); Difficulty (D); and Will or Will Not Be Active in Future (W). Subscale designations are indicated next to each item number.

The scale is scored on a 7-point scale with 1 = lowest and 7 = highest. Items keyed positively (+) have the more positive adjective on the right side and items keyed negatively (-) have the most positive adjective on the left side.

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure the meaning which an idea or a kind of person has for you by having you rate it by a series of descriptive words. Please make your judgments on the basis of what the kind of person or idea means to you. Do not worry or puzzle over individual terms. It is your first impressions, your immediate responses, that are wanted. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we do want your true impressions.

Here is how you are to mark this questionnaire. There are seven positions between each pair of words. If you feel the kind of person or idea is very closely related to one end of the scale, place your check mark next to that word (e.g. Hot: : : : : : : :Cold.) If you feel the idea or person is closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : : :Cold. If the idea or person seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but not really neutral) place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : : :Cold.

BEING ACTIVE IN YOUR COMMUNITY

Subscale	Keyed			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
E	-	1.	Smart	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dumb
N	-	2.	Unusual	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Usual
N	-	3.	Youthful	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Mature
O	+	4.	Easy	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Difficult
E	-	5.	Important	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unimportant
E	+	6.	Boring	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Interesting
N	-	7.	Modern	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Old-fashioned
E	+	8.	Selfish	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unselfish
E	+	9.	Useless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Useful
E	-	10.	Honest	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dishonest
	-	11.	Something I will do	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Something I :won't do

Career Exploration Scale

The Career Exploration Scale was adapted from the Student Attitude Questionnaire developed by the Educational Work Program of the Northwest Regional Laboratory (NWRL), Portland, Oregon (NWRL, 1978). This 25 item scale was developed as a tool for evaluating Experience-based Career Education Programs, and 15 items were selected from it. Rather than emphasizing self-reports about attitudes toward careers and work, this questionnaire focusses on actual behaviors in planning and exploring careers. It asks students to report "how frequently" in the past 12 months they have done such things as: "tried out activities related to the job or career field," or "thought about how well the job or career field matches your interests and abilities." The questionnaire was viewed as a more rigorous and appropriate assessment of the relation between experiential programs and career development than more traditional measures.

The original authors relied on rational judgment for the validity of the items and, as far as is known, no item analysis has been done by the NWRL group. However, as the items are simple and straightforward descriptions of career related behaviors, and the respondent is merely asked how often s/he has engaged in them, this was not viewed as a serious deficiency. A test-retest reliability check was run and a correlation of $r = .93$ was produced.

The responses to the Scale are most conveniently reported as a single score calculated by assigning the possible responses ("never" through "more than once a month") numbers 1 through 5. For this study the scale was also broken down into two subscales labeled Action and Information. Career Action items were those in which the student was engaged in experiential activities such as observing persons working in this career area, trying out tasks in the occupation, and talking with

people in it. Career Information includes items in which the student "learned about" the career area in more traditional ways, through lectures, reading, films, etc. The subscale key on page 24 shows which items were in the Action and Information categories.

CAREER EXPLORATION SCALE AND SUBSCALE KEY

Subscale designations are indicated next to the item number. A = Action and I = Information.

This scale is scored on a 5 point scale with 5 = highest and 1 = lowest.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire asks you to think of a job or career field that you might like to enter after completing your education and to answer some questions in relation to that career field or job. For the statements listed below please indicate on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (frequently) how often you have had each experience during the past twelve months. Most students have had some but not all of these experiences. Therefore, if you have not had that experience mark the answer sheet as 1 for never. If you have had the experience--select 2 if you have done it only once, 3 if you did it several times during the year, 4 if you did it about once a month and 5 if you did it more frequently than once a month.

IN RELATION TO A JOB OR CAREER FIELD YOU MIGHT LIKE TO ENTER, HOW FREQUENTLY DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU:

Subscale			Never	Once	Several Times	Once a Month	More Than Once a Month
A	1.	Talked about the job or career with relatives or friends.	1	2	3	4	5
A	2.	Talked about the job or career with persons employed in that career field.	1	2	3	4	5
A	3.	Talked about the job or career with teachers or counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
A	4.	Read materials about the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
A	5.	Observed activities in the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
A	6.	Tried out activities related to the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
A	7.	Worked in this job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
I	8.	Thought about racial, sex or other biases that may exist in the job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
I	9.	Thought about the steps necessary to prepare for the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
I	10.	Learned the range of pay for the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
I	11.	Learned the level of schooling or type of training required to enter the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
I	12.	Thought about the relevance of your current school program to the job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
I	13.	Learned the employment demand for people in this job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
I	14.	Thought about the lifestyle you would have with this job or career field (for example, the amount of money, working conditions, kind of friends).	1	2	3	4	5
I	15.	Thought about how well the job or career field matches your interests and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5

Instruments on Psychological Development

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale

This scale measures the self acceptance aspect of self esteem. Originally developed for use with high school students, it was designed specifically with brevity and ease of administration in mind (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). The scale consists of ten items answered on a four point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Self esteem, as defined by measures such as Rosenberg's is a highly stable attribute not particularly amenable to change through a short-term intervention. In this study it was employed only partially as a measure of change. Of equal value was its use as an individual assessment tool facilitating the investigation of questions such as whether students with higher self esteem scores are more likely to risk participation in an experiential course and/or are more likely to be satisfied with and to succeed in it. Its wide use with high school students, high acceptance, and ease of administration made it especially useful for this study.

Silber and Tippet (1965) found that the scale correlated from .56 to .83 with several other self esteem measures and clinical assessments. The same authors also found a test-retest correlation over two weeks of .85.

The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale is shown on page 26.

ROSENBERG SELF ESTEEM SCALE

SCORING KEY

Scoring Key . . . 4 = highest, 1 = lowest

Scores (4, 3, 2, 1) are shown for each individual item.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.	4	3	2	1
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	4	3	2	1
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	1	2	3	4
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people. .	4	3	2	1
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of..	1	2	3	4
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	4	3	2	1
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	4	3	2	1
8.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	1	2	3	4
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	1	2	3	4
10.	At times, I think I am no good at all.	1	2	3	4

Janis—Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale

This scale was originally designed to measure feelings of inadequacy in studies relating to a person's persuasibility. This test instrument is brief, has been used extensively in research, and has achieved wide acceptance as a measure of self esteem (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). It differs from more typical self-concept measures by its focus on self esteem in actual social situations rather than on more generalized feelings about the self. The difference can readily be seen by comparing items with the commonly-used Rosenberg self-concept scale. A typical Rosenberg item reads, "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself," in contrast to more situation-specific and socially-oriented items of the Janis-Field Scale such as, "When you speak in a class discussion, how often do you feel sure of yourself?"

The scale has held up reasonably well through tests of reliability and validity as reported by Robinson and Shaver (1973). Split-half reliabilities range from .72 to .88, and hold at these levels for even revised and shortened versions of the scale. For example, a ten-item version of the scale attained a split-half reliability of .80 (Taylor and Rietz, 1968). Robinson and Shaver further report correlations of .67 with the California Psychological Inventory and .60 with self ratings of esteem. It correlates only .35 with the Marlowe-Crowe Social Desirability Scale, indicating that this scale is relatively resistant to eliciting socially desirable responses.

As indicated above, the Janis-Field Scale is not only widely used, but is commonly used as a basis for study-specific scales and is available in a shortened version. For this study, a ten-item scale was used. The items chosen were the 10 with the highest inter-item correlation from the 20-item scale (Skolnick and Shaw, 1970). Each of these items represents situations which are common to high

school students and which they could reasonably be expected to encounter in a community-based experiential program. Because of its focus on perceived performance of self (vs. general assessment of worth), it was expected that this scale would be more sensitive to changes in the self perception of participants than the Rosenberg Scale.

JANIS-FIELD FEELINGS OF INADEQUACY SCALE - SCORING KEY

Scoring Key . . . 5 = highest, 1 = lowest.

Scores (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) are in the box for each individual item.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Read the sentences below and mark an "X" in the box that best decribes you.

	very often	fairly often	some-times	once in a great while	practically never
1. How often do you worry about whether other people like to be with you?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often do you feel sure of yourself among strangers?	5	4	3	2	1
3. How often do you feel confident that someday people you know will look up to you and respect you?	5	4	3	2	1
4. How often do you feel self-conscious?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you feel that you have handled yourself well at a party?	5	4	3	2	1
6. How often are you comfortable when starting a conversation with people whom you don't know?	5	4	3	2	1
7. How often are you troubled with shyness?	1	2	3	4	5
8. When you speak in a class dis-sussion, how often do you feel sure of yourself?	5	4	3	2	1
9. When you have to talk in front of a class or a group of people of your own age, how often are you pleased with your performance?	5	4	3	2	1
10. How often do you worry about how well you get along with other people?	1	2	3	4	5

Instruments on Intellectual Development

Problem Solving Inventory

This instrument, created especially for this study, was designed to test for changes in problem solving ability, a key element of intellectual capacity. The starting place in designing the instrument was the problem solving research pioneered by Spivack, Platt and Shure (1976). While a serious debt is owed to them, they cannot be burdened with more than scant responsibility for the final product which bears almost no resemblance to the instruments with which they worked.

The instrument is designed as a proximate measure of a person's inclination and ability to perform four tasks which are central to the process of solving problems involving interpersonal conflict. The tasks are taken from John Dewey (1910); Archambault (1964), and the protocol itself takes the respondent directly through the steps in problem solving which he delineated: a felt problem (approximated by a stimulus story); leaping to a solution; generating more choices and alternatives; considering the consequences; choosing; and evaluating the outcome (approximated by analysis of the problem). The protocols are scored according to the degree the respondent: 1) can generate alternative solutions to the problem; 2) actively seeks to resolve the problem and accepts responsibility for its resolution; 3) considers the merits of alternative solutions in terms of their consequences; 4) comprehends the complexity of the problem and is oriented to the growth of both self and others. See page 43 for a copy of the protocol.

The respondent receives four separate scores based on the elements in problem solving listed above. Scoring procedures for the first three measures are relatively simple and straightforward. The fourth is much more complex,

incorporating elements of several interrelated developmental perspectives including ego development (Loevinger, 1976), moral development (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971; Rest 1976a), role-taking (Selman, 1976), cognitive complexity (Perry, 1970), and level of need (Maslow, 1968). Exact directions on scoring this instrument are given at the end of the description. It is scored on a seven point scale made up of the following levels:

1. Impulsive Action

   Nothing written, no reasons given, no problem perceived.

2. Impulsive - Judgmental

   Usually some acknowledgment of a problem, but little or no evidence of their being any thought given to it. Lacks sense of responsibility toward, or shows no concern for others. Solutions or explanations expressed through snap judgments, labeling, arbitrary condemnation. May even recommend violence as the solution. Basically, little or no evidence of their being engaged in "problem solving" in any meaningful sense of the term. Attention to other's thinking limited to "beating some sense into them."

3. Self Protective

   Clearest concern and sense of responsibility is for self -- not being caught, or being manipulated, looking foolish. Others are important only as threats to oneself or as possible givers of concrete rewards to self. "Looking out for #1" and little doubt about who that is! Concern for other's thinking directed toward acknowledgment of oneself and own problems, not that of the other.

4. Formalistic -- Superficial Concern

   Does show some concern for other(s) but superficially so, as evidenced by being expressed via clichés, stereotyped thinking, invoking of conventional norms and values (more as slogans than as empathetic/sympathetic concern or understanding). Concern for rules and for appropriate role behavior. May focus on physical over psychological needs or causes. Concern for "niceness" etc., directed toward looking good more than with actually being that kind of person. Concern with cognitive issues not so much for helping the other rationally weigh the issue as to bring them to some foreordained conclusion -- usually the acceptance of some rule or conventional norm that is taken as absolute.

5. Relational Concern

   Between self and specific or generalized other(s). Strong emphasis on love, belonging, friendship, being liked, acting kind. Want to

be and to be known as a kind, giving, "good" person (seem to value this, not just to "look good" at the moment). Sympathetic to the needs of others and wants to avoid hurting them. Cognitive concern emphasizes opening and maintaining dialogue, and generally increasing information and understanding (of self, situation, and others).

6. Responsible Concern

Thinking seems to include level 5 concerns, but goes beyond friendship and sympathy to a concern for other's esteem, self respect, and independence. Attention to physical problems retains this respect with assumptions made thoughtfully, non-judgmentally, and usually tentatively held. May evidence thoughtful desire to live up to personal values, and may show clear awareness of value conflict, or question whether their own values are appropriate. Cognitive emphasis is on a person having information or understanding to empower them to make a better personal decision. Assumptions of incompetence (or of foregone conclusions) must be thoughtfully and tentatively and respectfully made.

7. Principled Concern -- Beyond Self and Other

Beyond immediate players in the situation to social, institutional causation and/or to generalized rules (principles) of behavior. Evidence of complex thinking, with explanations vividly expressed and consistent throughout protocol. Goes beyond responsibility for others' welfare to vivid concern for autonomy (i.e., beyond independence to basic right to dignity and self determination) for all persons. Statement of values and value conflicts also goes beyond immediate actors to apply to wider society. Focus on cognitive issues emphasizes right to personal autonomy, choice, self determination.

(Note: keys to distinguishing 7 from 6 are indications of social/institutional causation; wider application of analysis; consistency within the protocol; and vividness/complexity of discussion)

Validity

The primary (and preliminary) case for the validity of the instrument as a reasonable measure of problem solving is based on a rational analysis of its content and scoring procedures. As indicated above, the overall dimensions of the protocol are directly based on the steps in problem solving delineated by John Dewey. Additionally, the incorporation of four separate dimensions of problem solving makes it a broad measure of the concept, not seeking (or claiming) to assess a broad concept while measuring only a narrow slice of it.

Three of the four protocol elements (alternatives, responsibility, consequences) involve relatively straightforward scoring procedures that could be established without formulating a new theoretical framework. The fourth (cognitive complexity and empathy) did require such a construction. As indicated above, the seven levels in the index represent a combination of developmental perspectives. That they do in fact represent such a combination is partly based on rational analysis, but was also tested empirically. Thus part of the research procedure was to correlate a sample of student scores on this index with their moral reasoning scores from Rest's Defining Issues Test. This was done using the Pearson Product-Moment test and the scores correlated at a level of .43 (N=60). The likelihood of this correlation being a mere chance occurrence is less than .01. This finding suggests that the two tests do tap some common -- but not identical -- dimensions of thought and development. The convention of squaring the correlation suggests about a 20% (.19) overlap between the measures. This finding is consistent with the theoretical base for the test which includes moral reasoning as but one of five developmental/psychological dimensions incorporated in the scale. A smaller sample (N=20) was tested pre and post on both the Problem Solving and DIT tests. Change scores on the two tests were found to correlate at $\underline{r}$ = .78, an even stronger indication that they measure at least some common developmental elements.

One further indication of concurrent validity is the similarity of the Complexity/Empathy Scale to the scale of Prosocial Reasoning developed by Eisenberg (1978). Eisenberg investigated prosocial reasoning in elementary age children. One of her key hypotheses was that prosocial reasoning is somewhat different, and develops earlier, than the prohibition moral reasoning tested by Kohlberg. When presented dilemmas of a prosocial nature, children

will demonstrate higher cognitive maturity (less preconventional and more stereotyped and empathetic reasoning) than they will in response to Kohlberg-type dilemmas. To test the hypothesis she elicited student reactions to several prosocial dilemmas and created a nine-stage index for scoring their responses. The scoring index she developed (independently) very closely parallels the one developed for testing cognitive complexity and empathetic reasoning in this study.

Several other checks of concurrent validity could be usefully pursued. These would include establishing correlations with other developmental measures (Perry, Selman, Loevinger); with parent and supervisor reports of actual student behavior; and with respondent characteristics such as age, grade, sex, academic achievement and basic writing skill. Such tests would be interesting, but were beyond the scope of the present study.

The most critical validity-check of any test instrument is its ability to reflect or to predict actual behavior. Such a check was conducted on the Complexity/Empathy Scale. The directors of three programs were taught the content and the scoring system of the Scale. They were then asked to rate a random selection of their students on the Complexity/Empathy Scale based on their own observations of and interactions with them. Their assessments (made at the conclusion of the program and without seeing the students' protocols) were compared with their students' scores on the posttest. Their assessments coincided exactly with student scores in 73% of the cases with a Pearson Product-Moment correlation of $r = .84$ ($N = 45$).

Reliability

Four scorers were involved in scoring the problem solving instrument. Inter-rater reliabilities were calculated and are reported in Table I on the next page.

TABLE I

Inter-rater Reliabilities for Problem Solving Inventory

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations				
	Rater A			
	Alternatives	Responsibility	Consequences	Complexity/ Empathy
Rater B	.98	.90	.82	.92
Rater C	.99	.98	.94	.90
	Rater D			
Rater A	.97	.89	.85	.93
Rater B	.93	.75	.48*	.89

*With only 3 possible scores on this dimension and few subjects scoring lower than 2, inter-rater differences were likely magnified due to lack of range. The absolute agreement between Raters D and B on the Consequences dimension was 80%.

While the inter-rater correlations were extremely high, even further precision was desired because of the newness of the instrument. Thus, each protocol was scored independently by at least two scorers. Ratings were then compared and differences resolved in conference. Pretest scores from each of the four stimulus stories were compared, and no systematic differences were found in the mean scores elicited by the stories.

PROBLEM SOLVING SCORING GUIDE

The Problem Solving Instrument is designed as a proximate measure of a person's inclination and ability to perform four tasks which are central to the process of solving problems involving interpersonal conflict. The tasks are taken from John Dewey, and the protocol itself takes the respondent directly through the steps in problem solving which he delineated: a felt problem (approximated by the stimulus story); leaping to a solution; generating more choices and alternatives; considering the consequences; choosing; and evaluating the outcome (again necessarily approximated).

The protocols are scored according to the degree the respondent:

1. can generate alternative solutions to the problem (Generation of Alternative Index);

2. actively seeks to resolve the problem and accepts responsibility for its resolution (Action-Responsibility Index);

3. considers the merits of alternative solutions in terms of their consequences (Consequences Index);

4. comprehends the complexity of the problem and is oriented to the growth of both self and others (Complexity/Empathy Index).

GENERATION OF ALTERNATIVES INDEX

This index keys off questions 1 and 2 in the questionnaire: "What's the first thing you would think of to do or say?" and "What other things could you do or say -- try to list as many as you can."

Score by counting the number of different and relevant alternatives suggested. Count each separate idea as an alternative, even if respondent links them together in the same question or by a single letter. However, obviously identical responses listed twice count as one alternative.

EXAMPLES

Linked ideas

"Say I'm going steady with someone and he'd get angry, but I'd try to get her fixed up with someone else" -- count as two.

"I would go along with her at the time, and then try to find out from the nurses why she isn't allowed to leave" -- count as two.

"I would say I couldn't buy it for him as I'm too young" -- count as one.

Repetitive responses

"No" and "No way" -- count as one.

"My mother wouldn't let me" and "My father wouldn't let me" -- count as one.

"I'm busy every Friday" and "I have a date this Friday" -- count as two.

Irrelevant responses

"This is a ridiculous question" -- not counted (even if true).

Note: virtually every separate idea is counted even if obnoxious, ridiculous or seemingly facetious, so long as it pertains to the situation in some conceivable way.

ACTION - RESPONSIBILITY INDEX

This index keys off "best" response as indicated in question 3 (and reason given for choosing it): "Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best ___. Please explain why you chose it."

The focus is on who retains responsibility for the final decision/action, and on how directly the problem is dealt with.

1 = complete avoidance of the problem:

"Pretend you didn't hear."

"I would sit in another part of the room and not be part of the situation."

"I'd try to find another placement."

2 = clearly gives up responsibility and/or the decision to another (person, institution, rules):

"Report him to the ladies (head) right away."

"My parents don't allow me to buy any for me or anyone."

"Tell her to talk to the doctor, cause I'm just a volunteer here and it's none of my business."

"It's against the rules."

3 = some action taken, but it remains unclear who will make the final decision; or action taken which doesn't address the issue:

"I'll go talk to the director about it" (Note: not clear what the purpose of the conversation is, whether just to get more information or to ask some other person to make the decision or handle the problem.)

"Change the subject to something more pleasant." (Note: deals with the person but not around the problem.)

"We can talk about that later" or "Maybe some other time".

4 = clearly retains responsibility for decision or action (this could include asking for more information so respondent can make a better decision about what to do):

"Ask the teacher what the person can obtain from being in a closet for discipline."

"Ask the supervisor why he's not allowed to have alcohol."

"Talk to the lady about the problems of living alone."

CONSEQUENCES INDEX

This index keys off questions 3 and 4: "Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best ___. Please explain why you chose it." and "Choose one you rejected and list the letter of the item ___. Please explain why you rejected it."

The focus is on whether the respondent cites relevant reasons (or explanations) for action taken and if s/he does so in terms of consequences ("if...then").

1 = a. essentially a repeat of the answer, or non-explanation (e.g., "It's best")

b. one explanation and no other information

c. one moral imperative and no other information

d. two moral imperatives, or repeats of the same idea

2 = a. one consequence and no other information

b. two explanations

c. one consequence and one explanation

3 = a. consequence both under 3 (alternative accepted) and 4 (alternative rejected)

b. a clear consequence under 3 with no alternative rejected

c. consequences clearly stated as part of the alternatives under questions 1 and 2

Examples of Consequences, Explanations, and Moral Imperatives

Neither a consequence nor an explanation

"It's dumb." "It's the first thing I thought of."

An explanation

"The kid needs friends."

Moral imperative

"Alcohol is bad." "All people should be respected -- even if weird."

Consequence

"His feelings would be hurt." "They'd learn how it feels."

EMPATHY - COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY INDEX

This index keys off question 5: "Explain what you think is the 'real' problem behind the incident," but the total protocol should be taken into consideration.

This index is scored on the 7 point Empathy-Cognitive Complexity Scale, which combines two dimensions: the complexity and abstractness of the thought process the person uses for analyzing the problems and the degree of empathetic concern for the person or persons in the dilemma.

For each level, the description of the quality of empathy and cognitive complexity is given, followed by typical examples of this level.

LEVEL ONE

Impulsive Action

Nothing written, no reasons given, no problem perceived.

Examples

"I just think it's right."

"There's no problem that I can see."

"I don't know about nursing homes."

LEVEL TWO

Impulsive - Judgmental

Usually some acknowledgment of a problem, but little or no evidence of there being any thought given to it. Lacks sense of responsibility toward, or shows no concern for others. Solutions or explanations expressed through snap judgments, labeling, arbitrary condemnation. May even recommend violence as the solution. Basically, little or no evidence of being engaged in "problem solving" in any meaningful sense of the term. Attention to other's thinking limited to "beating some sense into them."

Examples

"He's an alcoholic." (vs. he may be one or could have a drinking problem)

"He's a dirty kid."

"The guy just has no self confidence." (and no indication that the respondent cares)

"The lady's senile."

"They gotta have some sense knocked into their skulls." (or any other such recommendations for violent action)

LEVEL THREE

Self Protective

Clearest concern and sense of responsibility is for self -- not being caught, or being manipulated, looking foolish. Others are important only as threats to oneself or as possible givers of concrete rewards to self. "Looking out for #1" and little doubt about who that is! Concern for other's thinking directed toward acknowledgment of oneself and own problems, not that of the other.

Examples

"He's just trying to manipulate me."

"I could get in trouble." or "I'd lose my job."

"I don't want to be seen with a retard."

"If you say you have a boyfriend, that may keep him from bugging you." (i.e., not because it could make the turndown easier for him to take)

"Because the rest of the class would turn on you instead."

"There's little chance of coming out of this one looking good."

"They don't see what they're doing to me."

LEVEL FOUR

Formalistic -- Superficial Concern

Does show some concern for other(s) but superficially so, as evidenced by being expressed via clichés, stereotyped thinking, invoking of conventional norms and values (more as slogans than as empathetic/sympathetic concern or understanding). Concern for rules and for appropriate role behavior. May focus on physical over psychological needs or causes. Concern for "niceness" etc., directed toward looking good more than with

actually being that kind of person. Concern with cognitive issues not so much for helping the other rationally weigh the issue as to bring them to some foreordained conclusion -- usually the acceptance of some rule or conventional norm that is taken as absolute.

Examples

"She's probably senile and doesn't know she can't move out."

"The man needs a shot and it's against the rules to drink."

"It's against the law for me to buy liquor."

"Problem is how to convince the old lady she can't move out."

"Jerry is poor and can't afford to keep himself up." "May have home problems."

"It'll make them think."

LEVEL FIVE

Relational Concern

Between self and specific or generalized other(s). Strong emphasis on love, belonging, friendship, being liked, acting kind. Want to be and to be known as kind, giving, "good" person (seem to value this, not just to "look good" at the moment). Sympathetic to the needs of others and wants to avoid hurting them. Cognitive concern emphasizes opening and maintaining dialogue, and generally increasing information and understanding (of self, situation, and others).

Examples

"All he really needs is someone who cares for him and enjoys his company."

"I don't think a relationship like that would work. Telling the student that would be slapping him in the face."

"The kid needs a chance and people aren't giving him one."

"He's not liked by the other kids. Doesn't know how to be friends."

"It could hurt you and make you feel guilty and it could hurt the other person if he ever found out the truth."

"They need to understand how what they're doing affects Jerry."

LEVEL SIX

Responsible Concern

Thinking seems to include level 5 concerns, but goes beyond friendship and sympathy to a concern for other's esteem, self respect, and independence. Attention to physical problems retains this respect with assumptions made thoughtfully, non-judgmentally, and usually tentatively held. May evidence thoughtful desire to live up to personal values, and may show clear awareness of value conflict, or question whether their own values are appropriate. Cognitive emphasis is on a person having information or understanding to empower them to make a better personl decision. Assumptions of incompetence (or of foregone conclusions) must be thoughtfully and tentatively and respectfully made.

Examples

"Having a person's confidence in you when making a decision he may dislike very much -- and -- the last thing he feels he needs is a young person to lecture to him."

(After rejecting saying "I might get fired" as being selfish, person goes on to say)--"Mixing alcohol with the medications he takes could later have an adverse effect."

"She has a right to choose for herself, but it could make a difference if she really thinks about how difficult it would be for an old lady to live on her own."

"The woman wants to feel needed and independent, but her health doesn't seem to allow it."

"The kids are taking their own insecurity out on the boy. The kids could be jealous of the boy's ability in math and science."

"The kids might feel Jerry caused their trouble, and they might take it out on him later. The problem is to stop the teasing but not to make the other children feel Jerry got them in trouble."

"Whether or not I'd be willing to go out with her socially -- maybe I'm being narrowsighted and prejudiced though."

LEVEL SEVEN

Principled Concern -- Beyond Self and Other

Beyond immediate players in the situation to social, institutional causation and/or to generalized rules (principles) of behavior. Evidence of complex thinking, with explanations vividly expressed and consistent throughout protocol. Goes beyond responsibility for others' welfare to vivid concern for autonomy (i.e., beyond independence to basic right to dignity and self determination) for all

persons. Statement of values and value conflicts also goes beyond immediate actors to apply to wider society. Focus on cognitive issues emphasizes right to personal autonomy, choice, self determination.

(Note: keys to distinguishing 7 from 6 are indications of social/ institutional causation; wider application of analysis; consistency within the protocol; and vividness/complexity of discussion)

Examples

"Children tend to make fun of people different from them. They have been taught what is 'normal' and 'acceptable'. They forget often about other's feelings and need to be reminded."

"My willingness and commitment to help retarded people. She very well could have something important to say and contribute and must be given every right to do it."

"It would be hard to tell a person with a mental handicap that he/she probably won't ever have a 'romantic' relationship with others that are 'normal'."

"Working in a nursing home you have to respect the residents. By saying A. (which pointed out some problems in moving) you give your opinion and along with it you might leave them questioning their attempt to move. You must not take away their dignity and self pride by turning everything over to the family or nursing home people. Besides, you give the lady something to talk about and encourage her to be proud of accomplishing something."

"The guy's probably been drinking brandy all his life and it goes down like milk. But once you get in a nursing home everyone thinks you're sick and senile and you get treated like a kid -- but maybe if I worked there a long time I'd start thinking the same as the others."

"Whether you have compassion to feel for the old person even though you're not personally involved" (would need information from rest of protocol to separate this from a level six response, but it's a good start toward seven).

PROBLEM SOLVING INVENTORY--Stimulus Stories

INSTRUCTIONS:
Following are actual incidents encountered by students in their action learning program. Read each incident carefully and project yourself into the setting as if it is a situation that you must deal with personally. As you read the story, think about what things you would do or say in the situation. Then answer the questions below:

You are working at a nursing home. You've come to be really good friends with one lonely old man there and you visit him every time you come. One day he tells you the only thing he really hates about the nursing home is that the staff won't let him have a drink. He hands you a couple of bucks and asks you to sneak a pint of brandy to him the next time you come. You say that you can't get any because you're underage, but he begs you. What do you do or say?

1. What's the first thing you would think of to do or say?
   a.

2. What other things could you do or say--try to list as many as you can.
   b.

   c.

   d.

   e.

   f.

3. Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best ____. Please explain why you chose it.

4. Choose one you rejected and list the letter of the item ____
   Please explain why you rejected it.

5. Explain what you think is the "real" problem behind the incident?

6. Have you ever had to handle a problem like this before? ____ yes ____ no

PROBLEM SOLVING INVENTORY (Continued)

Other Stimulus Stories

There is a boy in your elementary class named Jerry who is really smart in math and science, but can hardly read and doesn't write well either. Besides that, he is always dirty and messy (looks as if he has never combed his hair). He hangs around you and the teacher a lot. None of the other kids like him, don't like him to play with them, and tease him a lot and gang up on him. Today you walk in the room and some of the kids are again teasing him. What do you do or say?

You are working in a recreation program for retarded teenagers. You help supervise their Friday bowling "league". You help them get the right size shoes, keep score, remind people when it's their turn to bowl, and help guide the ball for the severely handicapped students. One of the retarded kids has been acting pretty affectionately toward you -- tries to hold your hand and hugs you. Toward the end of the afternoon, the retarded student asks if you would like to go on a date next Friday night. You say you're busy, but the student persists, saying "How about the next Friday?", and so on. What do you do or say?

You are a volunteer at a nursing home. Mrs. H. has been in the nursing home for three years. She had a small stroke, and walks with a cane. She is basically independent, but she sometimes needs help getting dressed and undressed. She has the idea that she's getting an apartment soon and will live there alone. No one knows where she got this idea; her daughters know nothing about it, and don't believe she is capable of living alone (cooking, housekeeping, etc.). Mrs. H. is making dishtowels and dishcloths and is very intent on moving. She says to you: "I've got to hurry up and finish hemming these towels because I'm moving out in a few days." What do you do or say?

You have been an intern in the District Attorney's office for the past six weeks. For the first three weeks you attended regularly. Recently, you have missed a few times. You did not always call and tell your supervisor, the District Attorney, you weren't coming. Since you began you have watched some trials, run errands, sat in on interviews with clients, and done some filing. You are supposed to help with an investigation of unfair pricing in two department stores, but it hasn't started yet because your supervisor has been too busy and you haven't been there for a while. Just as you are ready to leave school to go to your internship, a friend comes up and suggests that you come over to his/her house to listen to records and study for a big math test tomorrow. What do you do or say?

Instruments on Differential Program Impact

Characteristics of a Community Experience Checklist

One of the major problems in educational research and evaluation is that the assumption often has to be, or at least is, made that the program has been implemented as described and that all students participating in the program have had the same experience. That neither is usually the case can be readily attested to by anyone who has directed an educational program -- or had one directed at them. Thus it was an aim of this study to go beyond gross program descriptions and student characteristics and examine more directly the specific experiences of students within the programs. The major means of doing so was to present students with a list of statements describing what theorists and practitioners of experiential education contended were elements which made for successful experiences. Students were asked to indicate how often and how fully these statements described their own experience in their program.

The results from this questionnaire were analyzed in two steps. The first was to examine whether students who rated their program highly differed from other students in how they described their own experience. The second step was to use multiple regression analysis to examine the degree to which specific characteristics of experience could help predict or explain student growth on the measures used in this study.

The scale was adapted from one developed by Owens and Owen (1978), which asked students which features of a field experience they thought were critical in making it successful for the student. Our adaptation was, beside adding new items and eliminating several of the original ones, to ask students to indicate the extent to which these features were present in their own community experiences. The check list and scoring guide are shown on the following page.

Characteristics of a Community Experience Checklist

This scale is scored on a 5 point scale with 5 (very often) = highest and 1 (practically never) = lowest. Items are keyed both positively and negatively, which are noted.

INSTRUCTIONS: The following list describes some features of a community field experience. Please describe your particular experience by circling the appropriate number from 1 to 5.

Keyed			Practically Never	Once in a Great While	Some-times	Fairly Often	Very Ofter
+	1.	Had adult responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
+	2.	Had challenging tasks	1	2	3	4	5
+	3.	Made important decisions	1	2	3	4	5
+	4.	Discussed my experiences with teachers	1	2	3	4	5
-	5.	My ideas were ignored	1	2	3	4	5
+	6.	What I did was interesting	1	2	3	4	5
+	7.	Did things myself instead of observing	1	2	3	4	5
+	8.	Given enough training to do my tasks	1	2	3	4	5
+	9.	I was given clear directions	1	2	3	4	5
+	10.	Had freedom to develop and use my own ideas	1	2	3	4	5
+	11.	Discussed my experiences with my family and friends	1	2	3	4	5
+	12.	Adults at site took personal interest in me	1	2	3	4	5
+	13.	Had freedom to explore my own interests	1	2	3	4	5
+	14.	Had variety of tasks to do at the site	1	2	3	4	5
* -	15.	I never got help when I needed it	1	2	3	4	5
+	16.	Was appreciated when I did a good job	1	2	3	4	5
-	17.	Adults criticized me or my work	1	2	3	4	5
+	18.	Felt I made a contribution	1	2	3	4	5
+	19.	Applied things I've learned in school to my community placement	1	2	3	4	5
+	20.	Applied things I've learned in my community placement to school	1	2	3	4	5

*The wording of this item is ambiguous and will be changed in future versions to "needed more help from supervisor."

Appendix

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Center for Youth Development & Research
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

We would like to ask your help in a study of action and service learning programs in schools all over the United States. This is the first time such a study has been done and your answers will be very valuable for understanding what students get out of these programs. This information can help to improve and strengthen these programs.

Please remember that the following questions have no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in your honest reactions. Please ignore the numbers in parenthesis next to the answer blanks--they are there to help us.

Please write as neatly and legibly as you can. It would be unfortunate if we could not use your ideas because we couldn't read your writing.

Thank you very much for your participation in this study. We think the results will be of real help to high school and junior high school students all over the country.

INSTRUCTION FOR SECRET CODE NUMBER:

Your responses will be held in strictest confidence. To make sure that no one knows who filled out this questionnaire and to be able to match your answers to another questionnaire you will take later, we want you to use the following secret code:

1) Write your birthdate in numbers in the space below. For example, if you were born on May 9, 1962, you would write: 0 5 / 0 9 / 6 2
month day year

__ / __ / __
month day year

2) Write your initials in the boxes below:

First letter of your first name: ☐

First letter of your last name: ☐

3) Write the name of your school below:

_____

4) Today's Date: __ / __ / __
month day year

Page 2

QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire asks you to think of a job or career field that you might like to enter after completing your education and to answer some questions in relation to that career field or job. For the statements listed below please indicate on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (frequently) how often you have had each experience during the past twelve months. Most students have had some but not all of these experiences. Therefore, if you have not had that experience mark the answer sheet as 1 for never. If you have had the experience--select 2 if you have done it only once, 3 if you did it several times during the year, 4 if you did it about once a month and 5 if you did it more frequently than once a month.

IN RELATION TO A JOB OR CAREER FIELD YOU MIGHT LIKE TO ENTER, HOW FREQUENTLY DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU:

	Never	Once	Several Times	Once a Month	More Than Once a Month
1. Talked about the job or career with relatives or friends.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Talked about the job or career with persons employed in that career field.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Talked about the job or career with teachers or counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Read materials about the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Observed activities in the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Tried out activities related to the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Worked in this job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Thought about racial, sex or other biases that may exist in the job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Thought about the steps necessary to prepare for the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Learned the range of pay for the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Learned the level of schooling or type of training required to enter the job or career.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Thought about the relevance of your current school program to the job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Learned the employment demand for people in this job or career field.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Thought about the lifestyle you would have with this job or career field (for example, the amount of money, working conditions, kind of friends).	1	2	3	4	5
15. Thought about how well the job or career field matches your interests and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5

QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

INSTRUCTIONS

A. Look at the sample question below, but don't answer it until you have very carefully read the instructions below.

Almost Always True For Me	Some-times True For Me			Some-times True For Me	Almost Always True For Me
☐	☐	Some teenagers worry about school grades	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't seem to worry about school grades.	☐	☐

B. To answer these questions, there are two steps.

1) First, decide whether YOU are more like the teenagers on the left side who worry about school grades OR the teenagers on the right side who don't seem to worry about school grades. Don't mark anything down yet, but first decide which type of teenager is most like you and go to that side.

2) Second, now that you have decided which side is most like you, decide whether that is almost always true for you or sometimes true for you. If it's only sometimes true, then put an X in the box under sometimes true, if it's almost always true for you, then put an X in the box under almost always true.

C. Now continue to do the numbers below. For each number, you only check one box.

	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel bad when they let people down who depend on them	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't let it bother them that much.	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think it's the responsibility of the community to take care of people who can't take care of themselves	-BUT-	Other teenagers think that everyone should just take care of themselves.	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in doing something about school problems	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't really care to get involved in school problems.	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers let others do most of the work in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers help in a group all they can.	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers seem to find time to work on other people's problems	-BUT-	Other teenagers find taking care of their own problems more than enough to do.	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in what other students in class have to say	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't care that much about what other students say.	☐	☐

Page 4

	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are interested in doing something about problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers are not that interested in working on problems in the community.	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers carefully prepare for community and school assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers usually don't prepare that much.	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers would rather not present ideas in a group discussion	-BUT-	Other teenagers feel comfortable in presenting ideas in a group discussion.	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers let others know when they can't keep an appointment	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't call ahead when they can't make it.	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think people should only help people they know--like close friends and relatives	-BUT-	Other teenagers think people should help people in general--whether they know them personally or not.	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	For some teenagers, it seems too difficut to keep commitments	-BUT-	Other teenagers somehow manage to keep commitments.	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers' ideas are almost always listened to in a group	-BUT-	Other teenagers have a hard time getting the group to pay attention to their suggestions.	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think they have much say about what happens to them	-BUT-	Other teenagers think they can pretty much control what will happen to their lives.	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think it makes much sense to help others unless you get paid for it	-BUT-	Other teenagers think you should help others even if you don't get paid for it.	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are good at helping people	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't see helping others as one of their strong points.	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel obligated to carry out tasks assigned to them by the group	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't feel that bound by group decisions.	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think when good things happen it's because of something they did	-BUT-	For others, there seems to be no reasons--it's just luck when things go well.	☐	☐

	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME	SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME			SOME-TIMES TRUE FOR ME	ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE FOR ME
19.	☐	☐	Some teenagers prefer to have someone clearly lay out their assignments	-BUT-	Other teenagers prefer to make up their own lists of things to do.	☐ ☐
20.	☐	☐	Some teenagers aren't that worried about finishing jobs they promised they would do	-BUT-	Other teenagers would feel really bad about it.	☐ ☐
21.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think they are able to help solve problems in the community	-BUT-	Other teenagers don't think they can do anything about them because a few powerful people decide everything.	☐ ☐

QUESTIONNAIRE THREE

INSTRUCTIONS:

Read the sentences below and mark an "X" in the box that best decribes you.

	very often	fairly often	some-times	once in a great while	practically never
1. How often do you worry about whether other people like to be with you?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. How often do you feel sure of yourself among strangers?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. How often do you feel confident that someday people you know will look up to you and respect you?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. How often do you feel self-conscious?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. How often do you feel that you have handled yourself well at a party?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. How often are you comfortable when starting a conversation with people whom you don't know?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. How often are you troubled with shyness?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. When you speak in a class dis-sussion, how often do you feel sure of yourself?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. When you have to talk in front of a class or a group of people of your own age, how often are you pleased with your performance?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. How often do you worry about how well you get along with other people?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Page 6

QUESTIONNAIRE FOUR

INSTRUCTIONS:

Following are three actual incidents encountered by students in their action learning program. Read each incident carefully and project yourself into the setting as if it is a situation that you must deal with personally. As you read the story, think about what things you would do or say in the situation. Then answer the questions below:

* * *

1. YOU ARE WORKING AT A NURSING HOME. YOU'VE COME TO BE REALLY GOOD FRIENDS WITH ONE LONELY OLD MAN THERE AND YOU VISIT HIM EVERY TIME YOU COME. ONE DAY HE TELLS YOU THE ONLY THING HE REALLY HATES ABOUT THE NURSING HOME IS THAT THE STAFF WON'T LET HIM HAVE A DRINK. HE HANDS YOU A COUPLE OF BUCKS AND ASKS YOU TO SNEAK A PINT OF BRANDY TO HIM THE NEXT TIME YOU COME. YOU SAY YOU CAN'T GET ANY BECAUSE YOU'RE UNDER AGE, BUT HE BEGS YOU. WHAT DO YOU DO OR SAY?

1. What's the first thing you would think of to do or say?

   a.

2. What other things could you do or say--try to list as many as you can.

   b.

   c.

   d.

   e.

   f.

3. Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best ____. Please explain why you chose it.

4. Choose one you rejected and list the letter of the item ____ Please explain why you rejected it.

5. Explain what you think is the "real" problem behind the incident?

6. Have you ever had to handle a problem like this before? ____ yes ____ no

YOU HAVE BEEN AN INTERN IN THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE PAST SIX WEEKS. FOR THE FIRST THREE WEEKS YOU ATTENDED REGULARLY. RECENTLY, YOU HAVE MISSED A FEW TIMES. YOU DID NOT ALWAYS CALL AND TELL YOUR SUPERVISOR, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, YOU WEREN'T COMING. SINCE YOU BEGAN YOU HAVE WATCHED SOME TRIALS, RUN ERRANDS, SAT IN ON INTERVIEWS WITH CLIENTS, AND DONE SOME FILING. YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO HELP WITH AN INVESTIGATION OF UNFAIR PRICING IN TWO DEPARTMENT STORES, BUT IT HASN'T STARTED YET BECAUSE YOUR SUPERVISOR HAS BEEN TOO BUSY AND YOU HAVEN'T BEEN THERE FOR A WHILE. JUST AS YOU ARE READY TO LEAVE SCHOOL TO GO TO YOUR INTERNSHIP, A FRIEND COMES UP AND SUGGESTS THAT YOU COME OVER TO HIS/HER HOUSE TO LISTEN TO RECORDS AND STUDY FOR A BIG MATH TEST TOMORROW. WHAT DO YOU DO OR SAY?

1. What's the first thing you would think of to do or say?

   a.

2. What other things could you do or say--try to list as many as you can.

   b.

   c.

   d.

   e.

   f.

3. Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best _____. Please explain why you chose it.

4. Choose one you rejected and list the letter of the item _____
   Please explain why you rejected it.

5. Explain what you think is the "real" problem behind the incident.

6. Have you ever had to handle a problem like this before? ___ ___
   yes no

Page 8

QUESTIONNAIRE FIVE

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure the meaning which an idea or a kind of person has for you by having you rate it by a series of descriptive words. Please make your judgments on the basis of what the kind of person or idea means to you. Do not worry or puzzle over individual terms. It is your first impressions, your immediate responses, that are wanted. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we do want your true impressions.

Here is how you are to mark this questionnaire. There are seven positions between each pair of words. If you feel the kind of person or idea is very closely related to one end of the scale, place your check mark next to that word (e.g. Hot: : : : : : : :Cold.) If you feel the idea or person is closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : :Cold. If the idea or person seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but not really neutral) place your check mark as follows: Hot: : : : : : :Cold.

ADULTS

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
1.	Friendly	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unfriendly
2.	Powerless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Powerful
3.	Boring	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Interesting
4.	Confident	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Insecure
5.	Honest	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dishonest
6.	Changing	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Settled
7.	Selfish	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unselfish
8.	Successful	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unsuccessful
9.	Smart	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dumb
10.	Unfair	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Fair
11.	Competent	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Incompetent
12.	Stubborn	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Flexible
13.	Kind	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Mean
14.	Serious	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Fun-loving

BEING ACTIVE IN YOUR COMMUNITY

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
1.	Smart	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dumb
2.	Unusual	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Usual
3.	Youthful	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Mature
4.	Easy	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Difficult
5.	Important	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unimportant
6.	Boring	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Interesting
7.	Modern	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Old-fashioned
8.	Selfish	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unselfish
9.	Useless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Useful
10.	Honest	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dishonest
11.	Something I will do	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Something I won't do

	TERM							# OF TERM
1.	Kind	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Mean
2.	Worthless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Valuable
3.	Passive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Active
4.	Important	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Unimportant
5.	Weak	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Strong
6.	Smart	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Dumb
7.	Interesting	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Boring
8.	Bad	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Good
9.	Useless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Useful
10.	Beautiful	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Ugly
11.	Sick	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Healthy
12.	Slow	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Fast
13.	Competent	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Incompetent
14.	Complicated	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Simple
15.	Lovable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:Repulsive
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	

	QUESTIONNAIRE SIX	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people. .	SA	A	D	SD
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of..	SA	A	D	SD
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	SA	A	D	SD
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	SA	A	D	SD
8.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	SA	A	D	SD
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	SA	A	D	SD
10.	At times, I think I am no good at all.	SA	A	D	SD

QUESTIONNAIRE SEVEN

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE CHECK THE BOX THAT APPLIES TO YOU.

1. Male ( ) Female ( )

2. 7th grade ( )
   8th grade ( )
   9th grade ( )
   10th grade ( )
   11th grade ( )
   12th grade ( )

3. White ( )
   Black ( )
   Asian American ( )
   Native American ( )
   Spanish Surname ( )

4. Are you an--

   "A" student
   Between "A" and "B"
   "B" student
   Between "B" and "C"
   "C" student
   Between "C" and "D"
   "D" student
   Less than a "D" student

5. After high school, do you plan to enter: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY.
   1. The job market
   2. Vocational school
   3. College
   4. Armed services
   5. No plans yet
   6. Other _____

6. In the long run, what occupation do you feel you will prefer? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE ONLY.
   1. Trained technician or craftsman (beautician, draftsman)
   2. Farm management, agriculture, farmer
   3. Service (salesclerk, gas station attendant, waitress/waiter, etc.)
   4. Business executive, owner, manager
   5. Unskilled work
   6. Secretary, clerical, office work
   7. A professional life (doctor, nurse, lawyer, artist, engineer, teacher, etc.)
   8. A life centering on home and family
   9. Other _____

The posttest is precisely the same as the pp. 1-11 in the pretest book above. The only difference between pretest and posttest are the last two pages, reproduced below.

IF YOU ARE OR WERE IN AN ACTION LEARNING PROGRAM THIS SCHOOL TERM, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRES 7 & 8. IF YOU WERE NOT, PLEASE SKIP QUESTIONNAIRES 7 & 8 AND HAND THIS IN TO YOUR TEACHER.

Questionnaire Seven

1. What is your overall rating of this program as a learning experience?

Excellent ☐ (1) Good ☐ (2) Poor ☐ (3) Terrible ☐ (4)

2. If you had an excellent or good learning experience, what made it good or excellent?

3. If you had a poor or terrible learning experience, what made it poor or terrible?

INSTRUCTIONS: The following list describes some features of a community field experience. Please describe your particular experience by circling the appropriate number from 1 to 5.

	Practically Never	Once in a Great While	Some-times	Fairly Often	Very Often
4. Had adult responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
5. Had challenging tasks	1	2	3	4	5
6. Made important decisions	1	2	3	4	5
7. Discussed my experiences with teachers	1	2	3	4	5
8. My ideas were ignored	1	2	3	4	5
9. What I did was interesting	1	2	3	4	5
10. Did things myself instead of observing	1	2	3	4	5
11. Given enough training to do my tasks	1	2	3	4	5
12. I was given clear directions	1	2	3	4	5
13. Had freedom to develop and use my own ideas	1	2	3	4	5
14. Discussed my experiences with my family and friends	1	2	3	4	5
15. Adults at site took personal interest in me	1	2	3	4	5
16. Had freedom to explore my own interests	1	2	3	4	5
17. Had variety of tasks to do at the site	1	2	3	4	5
18. I never got help when I needed it	1	2	3	4	5
19. Was appreciated when I did a good job	1	2	3	4	5
20. Adults criticized me or my work	1	2	3	4	5
21. Felt I made a contribution	1	2	3	4	5
22. Applied things I've learned in school to my community placement	1	2	3	4	5
23. Applied things I've learned in my community placement to school	1	2	3	4	5

Questionnaire Eight

1. If you compared your action learning experience to an average class that you've taken in your school, did you learn:

   ___Much less? ___Less? ___About the same? ___More? ___Much more?

2. Was there a time set aside to talk with a teacher about field placement?

   ___Never ___Once during the whole time ___A few times ___Once a week

3. Was there a time set aside (a class or seminar) when you talked with other students who were in a field placement?

   ___Never ___Once during the whole time ___A few times ___Once a week

4. How many weeks did your field placement last? ___

5. How many days a week did you go to your field placement?

   ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 or more

6. Did you develop a really good personal relationship with someone during the program?

   (1) Yes ( ) If you answer yes, please answer the rest of the questions below.

   (2) No ( ) If you answer no, skip the rest of the questions below.

7. Who was the person? Check the box that applies to this person.

   ( ) supervisor
   ( ) another adult working at the site
   ( ) teacher
   ( ) person I was helping, please specify_____
   ( ) other, please specify
   _____

Now, please answer the following questions about your relationship with the person you identified in question 7. Circle the letter that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
8.	We liked each other	SA	A	D	SD
9.	That person and I talked about things besides work, like sports, hobbies, personal things	SA	A	D	SD
10.	That person respected and trusted me	SA	A	D	SD
11.	That person and talked about my future plans	SA	A	D	SD
12.	That person and I talked about what was happening at the site	SA	A	D	SD

Bibliography

Archambault, R. D. Introduction, in R. D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on Education: selected writings. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Berkowitz, L. Response to Stone. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2 (5), 757-758.

Berkowitz, L. and Daniels, L. R. Affecting the saliency of the social responsibility norm: effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 275-281.

Dewey, J. How We Think. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1910.

Eisenberg, N. H. The development of pro social moral judgment and its correlates. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1976.

Harris, D. B. A scale for measuring attitudes of social responsibility in children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 55, (1957) 322-326.

Harter, S. Perceived Competence Scale for Children. Scoring Manual, University of Denver, 1978.

Heise, D. Some methodological issues in semantic differential research. Psychological Bulletin, LXXII (1969), 406-422.

Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L. and Fitzgibbon, C. T. How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1978.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd Ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Kohlberg, L. and Gilligan, C. The adolescent as philosopher. Daedalus, 1971, 100, 1051-1086.

Loevinger, J. Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Maslow, A. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1968.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Education and Work Program. Student Attitude Questionnaire. Unpublished document, 1978.

Osgood, E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Owens, T. and Owen, S. Investigating student perceptions of essential elements to experiential education. Paper presented at 1979 annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, April 9, 1979.

Perry, W. G., Jr. Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Rest, J. R. New approaches in assessing moral judgment. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976, 198-218. (a).

Robinson, J. P. and Shaver, P. R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, the University of Michigan, 1973.

Selman, R. A developmental approach to interpersonal and moral awareness. In T. Hennessey (Ed.), Values and Moral Development. New York: Paulist Press, 1976, 142-166.

Silber, E. and Tippett, J. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1017-1071.

Skolnick, Paul and Shaw, Jerry. Brief note on the reliability of the Janis and Field "Feelings of Inadequacy" scale. Psychological Reports, 27, 1970, 732-734.

Spivack, G., Platt, J. J. and Shure, M. B. The Problem-Solving Approach to Adjustment: A Guide to Research and Intervention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Stone, L. A. Social desirability correlates of social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2(5), 756-757.

Taylor, J. B. and Reitz, W. E. The three faces of self-esteem. Research Bulletin #80, University of Western Ontario (Department of Psychology), April, 1968.